

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action dated October 2, 2008. In the Office Action, claims 1, 5-29, and 32-38 were pending and were rejected. With this Response, all claims are unchanged. In view of the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 5-7, 13-18, 25-29, and 37-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent Publ. 2003/0212561 – hereinafter “Williams”). Claims 8-10, 12, 19, 21-22, 32-34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Williams in view of Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,424,429 – hereinafter “Nakagawa”). Claims 11, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Williams in view of Nakagawa and Gorin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,003,459 – hereinafter “Gorin”). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Williams in view of Nakagawa and further in view of Aust et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,860,059 – hereinafter “Aust”). Of these, claims 1, 19, and 27 are in independent form.

Concepts described in the present specification relate to programming of speech enabled applications. In one embodiment, aspects described in the present specification relate to combining use of a stepwise module and an object oriented module. In one embodiment, described in one instance at page 5, line 22 – page 7, line 27, a system includes a stepwise module, for example a VoiceXML module, and an object oriented speech application module, for example a SALT module. Combined use of VoiceXML and SALT modules can provide increased functionality and flexibility (see page 7, lines 1-12).

In contrast, the cited Williams reference simply relates to use of a particular voice-capable markup language to provide voice testing (see paragraph [0003]). The testing system described by Williams provides a virtual telephone caller system that is used to test an interactive voice response system and generate text scripts in a particular voice-capable markup language.

More importantly, the aspects described by Williams are described for individual markup languages. For instance, the cited sections of Williams (i.e., paragraphs [0003], [0005], [0010]-[0011], [0061], [0063], [0073]-[0076]) describe concepts for use in a system using VoiceXML. Williams specifically states that the voice-capable markup language described in the disclosure of Williams “refers to one of a variety of extensible markup languages” (emphasis added) (see paragraph [0035]). While Williams states that these concepts can be used in another extensible markup language (see paragraph [0035]), nowhere does Williams teach, or even suggest, that the use of SALT programming can be combined with VoiceXML.

Moreover, in addition to failing to teach or suggest concepts related to combined use of VoiceXML and SALT, Williams also clearly fails to teach or suggest that SALT tags are embedded within a VoiceXML module or that a SALT module includes an object having a temporal trigger for initializing an operation associated with instructions of a VoiceXML module. Instead, the cited sections of Williams (i.e., paragraphs [0003], [0005], [0015], [0066], [0073]-[0076]) simply discuss that SALT is an example of a markup language in which scripts can be written for testing a system. Nowhere does Williams discuss triggers or initializing operations as claimed.

Further, Williams fails to teach or suggest that an operation initialized by a SALT module comprises at least one, but not all, of recognition, prompting, and messaging events or automatically invoking a temporal trigger when an object is encountered as claimed. Instead, the cited sections of Williams discuss a system using a particular voice-capable markup language to generate test scripts. The sections of Williams do not discuss combined use of VoiceXML and SALT.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

With respect to independent claim 19, it is respectfully submitted that the cited Williams reference does not teach or suggest use of a VoiceXML module and a SALT module as claimed. Moreover, Williams does not teach or suggest SALT tags to execute instructions associated with

a VoiceXML module where the SALT module initializes a recognition event for filling VoiceXML fields.

Further, the cited Nakagawa reference discusses providing an information processing apparatus for displaying a plurality of input fields for inputting data. However, Nakagawa does not teach or suggest initializing a SALT module to obtain speech input for filling fields of a VoiceXML module. This combination is simply not shown.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 19 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

With respect to independent claim 27, it is submitted that Williams does not teach or suggest a VoiceXML module for executing instructions and performing an operation embodied in a SALT module upon encountering an object associated with the instructions. Moreover, Williams does not teach or suggest performing an operation in a SALT module to provide at least one of, but not all, events in a dialog associated with speech recognition, DTMF recognition, speech prompting, and platform messaging as claimed.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 27 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

Further, it is submitted that related dependent claims 5-18, 20-26, 28-29, and 32-38 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to independent claims 1, 19, and 27, discussed above.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims 1, 5-29, and 32-38 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Christopher J. Volk
Christopher J. Volkmann, Reg. No. 60,349
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

CJV:lah